

# The Democratic Standard

DEVOTED TO THE SUPPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS—THE DIFFUSION OF GENERAL INTELLIGENCE—AND THE REFORM OF ALL POLITICAL ABUSES

BY D. P. PALMER.

GEORGETOWN, O., TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1844

NEW SERIES.—VOL. V. No. 9.

## TERMS OF THE STANDARD.

ONE YEAR, IN ADVANCE, \$200  
WITHIN THE YEAR, 2 50  
AT THE EXPIRATION OF THE YEAR, 3 00  
Payments will be considered in advance if made within three months after subscribing. If not, the paper will be discontinued, (unless at the option of the publisher,) until all arrearages are paid.

## PRICES OF ADVERTISING

12 lines three insertions, \$1 00  
For each subsequent insertion, 25  
For six months, 5 00  
For twelve months, 10 00  
Larger advertisements will be charged in the same proportion.

A reasonable deduction will be made on yearly advertisements.

All orders for advertising or job-work must be accompanied by the cash, except from those who have accounts with the office.

Office in the north end of the Market Building.

## From the Nashville Union. IMPORTANT LETTER FROM GEN. JACKSON IN FAVOR OF ANNEXING TEXAS TO THE UNITED STATES.

We call the special attention of our readers to the subjoined letter from the venerable patriot of the Hermitage, who looks to the question of annexing Texas to the United States with an anxiety and interest that seem to increase in proportion as the days which limit his continuance in this life approach their close. This letter presents, in our judgment, the most conclusive argument in favor of the policy of annexation that we have yet seen; and, coming as it does from Andrew Jackson, the General as well as the Statesman, who has so often exposed and thwarted the ambitious designs of Great Britain in regard to the United States, cannot fail to have great weight at this time with the American people. He treats it as a national question—one above all parties—involving the prosperity and safety of all sections and interests in our happy land; and it is difficult for us to realize that there can exist differing or opposing opinions to those which he expresses.

This letter, as will be seen from its perusal, and from the letter of Mr. Dawson, to which it is an answer, was written after the visit of that gentleman to the Hermitage; but was received by him just as he was leaving Nashville for St. Louis.

NASHVILLE, Aug. 26, 1844.

Sir:—On the eve of starting for St. Louis, I have received the enclosed letter from General Jackson, in answer to one I had addressed to him, requesting him to give me his views in relation to the advantages likely to flow from the annexation of Texas to this country, and the injury that would result to us if Great Britain succeeded in her designs upon that territory. As I shall not return directly to Cincinnati, and think that the opinions expressed by Gen. Jackson are important to the public, I have to request that you will give it a place in your columns, and oblige

Your friend and servant,

MOSES DAWSON.

To the editor of the Union.

HERMITAGE, Aug. 28, 1844.

Dear Sir:—I am in possession of your note of the 27th inst., and, although greatly fatigued by the excessive warm weather of this month, shall endeavor to reply to it.

The more I have reflected on the policy of annexing Texas to the United States, the more decided is my conviction, that since the establishment of the federal Constitution, no question has arisen of so great importance to the welfare and safety of the people of the United States. It seems to me that in this instance, as in the Revolution and our last war with Great Britain, kind providence still interposes to help on our efforts in the cause of self-government, and to give us the necessary guaranty for our independence.

Under the treaty of 1803, by which Mr. Jefferson obtained Louisiana from France, the people of that country acquired the right to incorporation in our Union as ample and complete as that possessed by the original States and their territories, and all their corresponding rights of citizenship and protection. In the treaty, therefore, of 1819, by which the people of Louisiana, west of the Sabine, were deprived of the guarantees of the treaty of 1803, a serious question arises whether this government can dismember its territory and disfranchise its citizens without their consent, and in the case of Texas, without the consent of France. But leaving out of view this solemn question, and looking only at the consequences which have followed the treaty of 1819, it is wonderful that the course of events is such as to enable us to repair the errors of that treaty, at the same time we avoid doing wrong to other powers, either on this or the continent of Europe.

The people of Texas have maintained their separate existence, and, after years

of battle and toil, have achieved their freedom and independence. And without stain on their character, without violating obligations with Mexico or other foreign powers, with no restraint on their sovereignty other than that which has been imposed by their God, they again come back to us, and tell us that, although the guarantees of the treaty of 1803 have been withdrawn from them, they are yet willing to embrace them. And the question is, what shall we say to them in reply?

But before answering this question, let us see if Mexico has any right to the territory of Texas, or any cause for resisting the extension to the citizens of Texas of the guarantees of citizenship as intended in the treaty of 1803. When did Mexico acquire any title to the territory of Texas? The title of France was conveyed to us, and that title was then recognized by all the civilized world as the only good one. Did we convey it to Mexico? We did not. We conveyed it to Old Spain and she did not convey it to Mexico. How, then, does Mexico derive her title? She pretends to none except what results from the confederation which was formed in 1824, and founded on revolution, in which compact Texas expressly stipulated that her separate sovereignty was retained. The overthrow of that confederation or compact by military force gives Mexico no title to the territory, unless she can show that she has conquered one—and if we examine the claim on the score of conquest, it is notoriously unjust. That claim was silenced by the battle of San Jacinto; after which event the principal powers of the world recognized Texas as an independent State. There is no reason for the opposition now made by Mexico to the annexation of Texas to the United States—none founded on any just claim to the territory or the loyalty of the citizens of Texas.

We are then brought to the unembarrassed question—is it right for us to possess Texas on reasonable terms proposed by her? Is it a step necessary to our safety and prosperity? I say it is, and as you have requested my reasons, I will briefly state them.

That territory is represented by Mr. Thompson, and other gentlemen of character who have the means of judging correctly, as possessing some of the finest lands in the world. In soil, climate and productions, it is said to surpass the Florida, and to equal Louisiana and Mississippi. As a portion of our confederacy, then will it not benefit us in the same manner that the States just mentioned, and other new States, have done? Have not these States contributed to the wealth, safety and prosperity of the other portions of the confederacy? Have they not furnished homes for thousands and thousands of happy and free people engaged in the noble pursuit of agriculture, exchanged in our own foreign markets, given healthful employment to our manufacturing and navigating interests, and to the various mechanical arts? Unless the measure of our prosperity is different from that which is applicable to all other nations, it is impossible to resist the conclusion, that it will be promoted by the annexation of Texas. This conclusion I deem self-evident.

But great as are the advantages of annexation in the encouragement which will result to our industrial pursuits—advantages in which all sections of the Union will participate—they are not so important as the security which Texas in a military point of view offers us. It is in this aspect of the question I shudder when I look at the course of the newspaper press opposed to annexation, and read the speeches of many public men—who, absorbed in the effort to make a President, seem to care nothing for the intrigues of Great Britain to defeat our true policy.

We have labored for many years to free the States composing our Union of the Indian population within their limits, and may be said to have just succeeded in the accomplishment of this humane policy. These Indians are now placed on our western frontier, and in a territory favorable to their gradual civilization and protection against the intrusion of influences hostile to them and to us. At present they are not accessible to British influence, except on the northern boundary line. Is it not apparent, however, that the whole of our policy in respect to their civilization, will be thwarted if any foreign power acquires control over Texas? The line between Texas and the Indians extends some thousands of miles, and communicates with Oregon in the most direct and practicable route to the great river of that territory. Texas, therefore, in hostile hands, could feed and sustain an army that could not only act against Oregon, but at the same time against Louisiana and Arkansas, and by conjunction with the Indians could make incursions on every western State to the lakes. An army thus employed, seconded by a proper organization of force on the

lakes, would put the whole west in a blaze and cause us more injury in blood and money in six months, than years of peace could atone for.

The aspirants of England understand much better than we do the force of the military considerations I am here suggesting; and hence, you will find that no pecuniary obligation will be deemed by them too great to prevent the annexation to this country. The success of our free system, its capacity to secure order, to promote the progress of the arts and sciences, and to stimulate the energies of our nature, to a point far higher than any yet attained under the forms of government in the old world, is alarming to the advocates of monarchy. The further progress of our principles will be a demonstration which the popular mind throughout the world cannot mistake, and opposition to these principles is therefore a necessary part of European policy, and it would be as short sighted for us to take for granted that a different feeling will control their policy, as it would be for one of our navigators to embark on the ocean without chart or needle, to aid him in weathering storms and preventing shipwreck. So settled do I consider this antagonistic feature of monarchy and republicanism, in the present state of the world, that I would feel safe in inferring what our course ought to be in reference to this measure of such vital national interest, by finding out what was the course of Great Britain. Our position here, as it has been generally heretofore, will be found to be directly opposite to hers.

But why should I press on you further views of the paramount importance of Texas to the United States on the score of safety? Every mind conversant with the operations of war, and with the causes which give military ascendancy, must see from a glance at our map, that such a genius as Wellington's or Napoleon's, sustained by naval armaments on the gulf of Mexico, and on the lakes, and in possession of Texas, with a very small force on land, could in one campaign, paralyze one half of our Union, deprive us of Oregon, and produce scenes of servile insurrection and massacre, that humanity would shudder to describe. This is no fancy sketch—no chimera of the imagination, to frighten women and children. It is the natural operation of cause and effect—inevitable and irresistible.

Give Texas and Oregon to Great Britain, and she will have more territory on this continent than the United States. She will surround us from our northeast corner to our southwest corner. Leaving no outlet to us by land, we shall be literally embraced in her potent grasp, and open to her invasion by sea and land at every point of the Union.

And yet we are told by leading politicians of the day, that the project of annexation is a mere bubble blown for a political purpose, to put down one leader, and put up another—and this too on the face of assurances that reach us every day—which tell us that England holds in her hand a guarantee of peace to Texas, if she will only withdraw the proposition of union with us. I am proud to see that my friends throughout the Union are treating these foreign menaces as American patriots should who love their country, and are determined to stand by it in all emergencies without regard to party.

Let us next see, in answer to your third, fourth and fifth inquiries, what would be the probable effect of the determination of Texas to accept the guarantee of monarchical powers. A treaty of commerce would be the first result, and the basis of this treaty would be one of reciprocal benefit, in the exchange of the raw productions of Texas for the manufactured articles of those powers.

England would aim at once to destroy the manufacturing interests of this country in competition with her: to do this she would be the gainer by opening her ports to Texas, and Texas in her turn, first, anxious for the payment of her national debt, would so adjust her revenue laws as to give the greatest possible stimulus to the culture of cotton and tobacco, and the development of her agricultural resources. Thus her debt would soon be paid, and her prosperity would be accelerated by the double force of European aid and domestic pride—numbrous on the one hand by high duties, upheld on the other by deep seated determination of the European powers to cripple the United States, and scatter among them the seeds of discord and jealousy.

Among other disadvantages resulting to us from such a treaty between England and Texas, would be the necessity to establish on that extensive frontier such police as would prevent smuggling and enforce our revenue laws. Could this be done? All experience answers, no—it cannot be done. Border citizens, having the same interests in trade, following the same pursuits, using the same in-

struments for the transportation of their surplus labor, will not submit to the operations of unequal laws. The cotton planter on the southwestern boundary, within the United States, will not contribute to the enforcement of laws, the effect of which makes his labor less profitable than that of his neighbor in Texas; and what is true of cotton will be true of all other agricultural products. We know that at present, in the United States, the force of this principle is so strong as to compel us to put low duties on many articles which would be otherwise heavily taxed.

I know that many of our citizens suppose that the annexation of Texas will be injurious because it will add to the quantity of valuable lands in market, and may be the means of inducing the removal of many of our slaves to that favored region. I grant that this is true to some extent—but does it not increase the arguments in favor of annexation? If Texas has an advantage in cheapness of land, salubrity of climate and convenience of navigation, over our southern States, is it not better for the citizens of the United States to possess this advantage, than to surrender it to the citizens of Europe? In the hands of Great Britain this advantage will be improved, as we have seen, to break up our manufactures and lessen our capacity to compete with her in the supply of other markets and in the carrying trade. In other words, will not Texas, out of our Union, be a more formidable competitor than she would be in it? The Iron and coal regions of Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky and Tennessee, if she is in the Union, will find a market there—so will the Lowell and other cotton manufactures of the North Atlantic side of our Union. The immense power of our inland trade, the nursery of our seamen, and the source of so much wealth, will find employment in Texas, if she is in the Union. If she is out of the Union, British policy may monopolize all these advantages.

We are also told by some who profess to speak on behalf of the sugar planters in Louisiana that Texas must not come into the Union, for, if she does her lands are made less valuable; and the price of sugar will fall. If the fact were so, does it follow that an argument is thereby afforded for the rejection of Texas? This would only prove to too vast number of the consumers of sugar that Texas ought to be added to the Union. But is it probable that the price of sugar would fall? We know that the production of Louisiana is now so limited, that the large protective duty extended to it has, thus far, not diminished the revenue from this article; and we also know, that the lands of Texas could be brought into cultivation for many years. So that the probability is, that sugar, in Texas, would stand on the same footing with cotton and other agricultural productions, far more advantageous to the United States if in the Union than out of it. But were it otherwise I feel confident that the sugar planters of Louisiana will repel the imputation that, on account of a possible competitor being raised up in Texas, they were willing to see that fair country pass into the hands of England. The sugar planter, wants security for his negro property, stability for the Union, and independence for his whole country. To gain this, he will make the same sacrifice, if necessary, according to my view of the subject. All the interests and all the sections of our Union, instead of having sacrifices to make will only have benefits to enjoy.

There are many other aspects in which it can be made manifest that England will injure the United States if it is rejected. But they are too obvious to bring to your notice. Take those already noted—take the question as it stands—the indisposition of the United States to profit by them is the most remarkable event that has occurred in history. No nation under similar circumstances, has committed such an error. If there be patriotism in the effort to increase the wealth and happiness of all classes in our society—to diffuse the blessings of equal laws, and a just government—if there be love in the spirit which finds in this free land of ours the means to spread the light of the gospel, and to teach the free man throughout the world how he may recover his right to civil and religious liberty—it seems to me that all this patriotism—all this philanthropy—all this religion—appeals to us in favor of the addition of Texas to our Union.

But it has been asked, not by you, but by others, if these cogent reasons exist, why did they not influence me when I was President? My answer is, that at that time the people of Texas had existed as a separate sovereignty but a few months before the close of my administration, and were then at war with Mexico, not claiming the benefits of the treaty of 1803, and not objecting to the cession of the territory to old Spain in 1819. The independence of Texas was recognized the last day of my

administration. I was not responsible for the policy which dismembered that Territory, and had no power to remedy the consequences of that dismemberment. It was my duty to be just to both Mexico and Texas, and keep the United States from becoming a party to their quarrel. This duty was faithfully performed. No interference on the part of his government was encouraged or countenanced. The brave Texas troops, acting for themselves, terminated at St. Jacinto their contest for liberty, and then settled their title and claim to Independence. From that period to this our relations to them have been changed, and the question of the proposed connection with them has now ceased to be embarrassed by the designs or expectations of Mexico.

The dismemberment of our territory in 1810, by the failure to execute the guarantee in the treaty of 1803, has but recently attracted public attention. But it has been silently operating, and is now exerting a great and momentous influence on our system of Government. It has been thus with most of the causes that have produced changes in human affairs—unforeseen—perhaps hardly noticed in the beginning—but not the less potent in the result after the lapse of time when connected with the vital principle. May we not trust that this mistake of our statesmen in 1819 has been ordered by a wise Providence, as a lesson for us never hereafter to dismember any portion of our territory, or permit, under any circumstances a foreign power to acquire a foothold on our free soil.

I have thus, my friend, delineated as rapidly and truly as I could the views I take of the question of annexation. I shall probably not be alive to witness the consummation of any of my anticipations; but I have the consolation of knowing that I have contributed what I could to guard my country against the danger of yielding to the suggestions of those who advocate the policy aimed at by Great Britain.

I remain as usual,

Your friend,

ANDREW JACKSON.

## "HENRY CLAY ESPOUSED THE CAUSE OF AARON BURR"—THE CHARGE MADE AND DENOUNCED BY THE CINCINNATI GAZETTE, PROVEN BY INCONTESTIBLE EVIDENCE—BY ONE WHO "ESPOUSED THE CAUSE" WITH CLAY!

On the 29th of July last we charged Henry Clay with having espoused the cause of that arch traitor to his country, AARON BURR. To make such a charge—a heinous crime against the Union and its Constitution—against the peace and property and rights of millions—upon such a man as Clay, the aspirant for the highest honor that country, which he sought to betray, can bestow upon its sons, is a very grave matter, and one of such responsibility that it should not be made without substantial evidence. The evidence, when the charge was first made, was the letter of Aaron Burr himself, to Henry Clay, which he then published, in which Burr said to Clay he "had not espoused the cause of a man, in any way unfriendly to the laws," &c.

This was pounced upon by the Cincinnati Gazette and other whig papers, and the choicest epithets from the vocabulary exhausted in repelling it as false and infamous—the Gazette charging us with the gross distortion of truth, and asserting that Clay only as a lawyer "espoused the cause of Burr."

Since this matter has occasioned so much fluttering among the whig partisan organs, we commend the following to further notoriety. Those presses that have outraged all the obligations of religion, morals, truth and public opinion by their flagrant assaults upon the ancestry of Col. Polk, denouncing them as Tories in the Revolution, and when convicted of foul libel by the living evidence, still reiterating the damnable lie, can here see the effect of their course;—they find their own chief charged with being identified with the most dangerous traitor, in the Union ever harbored or was threatened with, and was the instrument to prevail upon others to do the same.

Affidavit of John Downing, of Lexington, Kentucky.

At the time of Aaron Burr's first visit to the town of Lexington, I was sent for by John Jordon to come to his house. Upon going there, I found Burr, John and Major Boyd, sitting in a room together. Jordon introduced me to Col. Burr, who invited me to accompany him up stairs. I followed on until he led me into the garret. When there alone with him, he developed what he represented to be his plan, and solicited me to join him in the character of a spy, for which duties he stated I had been recommended by Jordon. His designs, as unfolded by himself to me, were upon Mexico, and he presented the prospects of immense wealth. He likewise declared to me that

many individuals of the highest respectability, in the place and elsewhere, had associated themselves with him. I heard no intimation of any unfriendly designs upon the Union.

After leaving Burr, I consulted some of my friends as to the propriety of joining him. Among the rest Mr. Henry Clay, who was at that time a respectable young lawyer of the town, and my particular friend. He advised me by all means to engage in the project, urging a variety of reasons why it was better for me than to continue laboring at my trade of a carpenter. As a further inducement, he stated that he himself was engaged with Burr and intended to go with him. After this interview with Clay, and one with Jordon, and the idea that they were going, I made up my mind to engage with Burr in his schemes, regarding them as I did as perfectly legitimate and proper. After I had become one of Burr's men, I had repeated interviews with him in Jordon's garret, to which no one was admitted but ourselves. When I had concluded and departed from the room, some one else would be admitted singly and alone; in returning from the interviews, I have repeatedly met Clay ascending to the garret, into which he was admitted by Burr to a private interview. I have often, in going up to the garret met Mr. Clay descending, and I particularly recollect that on one occasion he left the garret room in which Burr was just as I entered.

When Mr. Clay was in this place he sent a young man to me to complain that I had charged him with being associated with Burr, I replied that I did not know that I could prove the fact on Mr. Clay, for I had only his (Mr. Clay's) word for it, together with the positive assurance of Aaron Burr, and I further answered, that if Mr. Clay would call upon me, I would satisfy him that he had so stated to me, if he would acknowledge the truth.

Mr. Clay did not pay me the visit desired. It was a matter of public notoriety at the time Burr was here, that Clay was his particular friend. I determined at one time to abandon my intention of accompanying Burr, and upon making the suggestion to Mr. Clay, he dissuaded me from it in the strongest terms, and finally succeeded in fixing me in my original determination.

Given under my hand at Lexington, Ky. this 3d day of October, 1828.

JOHN DOWNING.

FAYETTE COUNTY, &c.

Personally appeared before me, the subscriber, one of the Justices of the Peace for the county aforesaid, John Downing, and made oath that the facts set forth in the above statement are true to the best of his knowledge and belief. Oct. 3, 1828. O. KEEN, J. P.

## CERTIFICATE.

We have known John Downing, a citizen of Lexington, as a mechanic, for many years—some of us more than twenty. We do not hesitate to say, that we know nothing to impair his standing, on oath, which should be entitled to full credit and belief.

E. Warfield, George Norton, J. Postlewait, W. Leary, Chas. Wickliffe, J. W. Bull, Samuel Trotter, Geo. McCalla, R. T. Hawkins, W. W. Whitney, L. Stephens, Will Clark, John Lowrey, C. Hunt, R. S. Todd, O. Keen, Alex. Stephens, L. Hawkins, C. H. Wickliffe, F. M. Lean, James Clark.

Lexington, Oct. 4, 1828.

The original of the above statement and certificate is left at the office of the Kentucky Gazette, free for the inspection of all parties.

James Clark, of these signers, was at that time a member of Congress from Mr. Clay's former district; and the others of justice were the Administration men in the highest respectability in Lexington and Fayette counties, many of whom are now living.

Now, reader what are you to think of Henry Clay? If Mr. Burr was innocent of treason, why does Henry Clay stimulate John Binn, Pleasant, Hammond, Smith, Worsley and the other pro-Burr men, to assail Gen. Jackson as a traitor? If Burr was innocent, Mr. Clay is guilty of supporting false witnesses against Gen. Jackson. If Burr be guilty, then was Henry Clay a traitor. Turn this subject as you will, it ends in his guilt and shame. And are we, American people to be sold? Are we to barter our birthrights, the suffrages of millions of freemen, to continue ill-gotten power in such hands? Forbid it, Heaven!—Cin. Eng.

## Lambs' Wool Wanted.

The undersigned wishes to purchase a quantity of Clean Lambs' Wool, for which the market price will be given, at my Hat Store in Georgetown.

JOHN KAY.

June 7, 1844.